

Remarks

I. Introduction

This paper is submitted in response to the Advisory Action mailed January 5, 2005. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the telephone conference of March 1, 2005 to discuss the status of the pending claims.

A complete listing of all pending claims is submitted herewith. Claims 27-42 are pending in the above-identified application. All the pending claims have been rejected. By this Supplemental Response and Amendment (this "Supplemental Amendment"), claims 31, 37-38, and 40 have been amended, and the status of the claims has been corrected in the "Amendment to the Claims" section of this Supplemental Amendment to reflect current amendment practice. This Supplemental Amendment is believed to place the above-identified application in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added to this application by this Supplemental Amendment.

II. The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112 Should Be Withdrawn

Claims 31, 32 and 37-40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner states that claims 31, 37-38, and 40 are indefinite because there is no direct antecedent basis for the recitation of "the absorber" or the "absorbed compounds." By this Supplemental Amendment, claims 31, 37-38, and 40 have been amended to correct this typographical error.

Applicants note that the amendment to claim 31¹, which was made in Applicants' Amendment dated December 22, 2004 (the "Amendment"), was *not* entered by the Examiner (*see*, Advisory Action, January 5, 2005). This previous amendment to claim 31 is not believed necessary in view of the amendments to claim 31 currently requested herein, and it is requested that this previous amendment to claim 31 be disregarded.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 31, 32 and 37-40 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

III. The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103 Are Believed Withdrawn

In the Office Action dated September 23, 2004, certain claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103.² Applicants' remarks with respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 as set forth in the Amendment are incorporated in this Supplemental Amendment, and not repeated herein. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 are believed to have been overcome by Applicants and accordingly believed withdrawn by the Examiner.

¹ In this Amendment, the language "monolithic porous carbon" of claim 31 was added to replace the term "monoliths."

² Claims 27-29 and 40-42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,750,026 to Gadkaree et al. ("Gadkaree et al.") in view of EPO reference number 0,254,551 ("EPO '551"); claim 30 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gadkaree et al. in view of EPO '551 further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,914,294 to Park et al. ("Park et al."); claims 31-36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gadkaree et al. in view of EPO '551 further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,110,328 to Yokota et al. ("Yokota et al."); and claims 37-39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gadkaree et al. in view of EPO '551 further in view of Yokota et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,628,819 to Mastemaker et al. ("Mastemaker et al.").

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Walter M. Egbert, III
Patent Office Reg. No. 37,317

Attorney for Applicants

BAKER BOTTS, L.L.P.
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112
(212) 408-2561